

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant is submitting herewith three sheets of replacement drawing figures, which include FIGS. 2, 3, 7, and 11. The submitted replacement figures are intended to replace FIGS. 2, 3, 7, and 11, originally filed on August 7, 2003.

Attachment: Three (3) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant hereby cancels claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-27, 29-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47-51, 53-57, 59-63, 65-69, 71, and 72, without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, and 70 are all the of claims pending in the application.

I. Formal Matter

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they fail to show the necessary textual labels of features or symbols or steps in FIGS. 3, 7, and 11. Applicant hereby amends FIGS. 3, 7, and 11 to includes the necessary textual labels and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings. No new matter is added.

II. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner objected to claims 1-6, 25-30, and 49-54. The Examiner rejected claims 7-12, 19-24, 31-36, 43-48, 55-60, and 67-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner withdrew the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over the previous combination of references but claims 1-72 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a new combination of references.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-3 and 5, claims 25-27 and 29, claims 49-51 and 53, claims 4 and 6, claims 28 and 30, and claims 52-54 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 as allegedly including substantial duplicates.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is moot as a result of the cancellation of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-27, 29-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47-51, 53-57, 59-63, 65-69, 71, and

72, without prejudice and for reasons unrelated to the objection. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the claims.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7-12, 19-24, 31-36, 43-48, 55-60, and 67-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant hereby amends claims 10, 22, 34, 46, 58, and 70, without narrowing, for purposes of clarity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 22, 34, 46, 58, and 70 are clear and definite and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection is moot with respect to claims 7-9, 11, 12, 19-21, 23, 24, 31-33, 35, 36, 43-45, 47, 48, 55-57, 59, 60, 67-69, 71, and 72, which are canceled, without prejudice, for reason unrelated to the rejection.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,257 to Olarig et al. (hereinafter "Olarig") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,300 to Harada et al. (hereinafter "Harada"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection at least in light of the comments which follow.

Independent claims 4, 28, and 52 each recite, *inter alia* and in some variation, generating connection route information indicating which interface of the plurality of interfaces is used to

connect the external device that has provided the device identification information, and associating the function limit with a combination of the device identification information and connection route information to obtain a cryptographic key. Applicant respectfully submits that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Olarig does not teach these features.

The Examiner alleges that the connection route information is the same as the site code according to Olarig. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully notes that the connection route information indicates which interface of the plurality of interfaces is used to connect the external device. On the other hand, the site code according to Olarig merely identifies a particular system to which a device is connected, and not a particular interface of that system (*see* col. 3, lines 18-34 and lines 59-66 of Olarig).

Because the site code identifies a particular system, Olarig discloses that the site code may be used to ensure that a particular hardware device only operates on the system on which it was originally installed (*see* col. 3, lines 31-34 and 59-66 of Olarig). The site code according to Olarig does not contain any information about which interface of the plurality of interfaces is used to connect the external device. Thus, Olarig does not disclose generating connection route information indicating which interface of the plurality of interfaces is used to connect the external device that has provided the device identification information. Applicant respectfully submits that Harada does not cure this deficiency of Olarig.

At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 28, and 52 are patentable over Olarig and Harada. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 16, 22, 34, 40, 46, 58, 64, and 70 are patentable over Olarig and Harada at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 4, 28, and 52.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is moot with respect to claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-27, 29-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47-51, 53-57, 59-63, 65-69, 71, and 72, which are hereby canceled, without prejudice.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Eric S. Barr
Registration No. 60,150

Date: September 9, 2008